REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 11-21 are now pending in the application. Applicant recently filed a response to the Office Action dated February 21, 2003. On further reflection, it occurred to Applicant's representative that a few points were not clearly made in the response. Applicant's representative is filing this supplemental response to better state these points, and respectfully requests that the Examiner also consider the included clarifications.

In the response, Applicant's representative stated:

The Examiner's proposed embodiment, in its unfolded form, is not rectangular. Indeed, once folded, the folded form would be rectangular - but folded forms cannot generally be printed in computer printers. Even the thickness of singlesheet forms must be carefully controlled to allow for printing in a computer printer, as shown in materials provided as exhibits, and discussed in the following paragraph, but folded forms cannot be reliably oriented and printed in a computer printer. The single-sheet registration form and key packet includes die-cut slots and perforations for example, with critical tolerances for compatibility with a printer, and folding the single-sheet registration form and key packet prior to printing would vastly compound the problems attendant with meeting these tolerances. Whether or not the Examiner's proposed embodiment is rectangular after folding is therefore quite immaterial. The Examiner's proposed embodiment is not rectangular when unfolded, and therefore is not suitable for printing in a computer printer in unfolded form. The Examiner's proposed embodiment is rectangular after folding, but a folded form is not printable in a computer printer. Whether folded or not folded, the Examiner's proposed embodiment would not be reliably printable in a computer printer.

Applicant provides, as an enclosure, a declaration and exhibits that detail interactions with a major client regarding certain of the many parameters that need to be considered for producing a single-sheet registration form and key packet that can be printed in a commercially available computer printer. As will hopefully be appreciated by the Examiner, producing such a form is not simply selecting dimensions and shape, although those considerations are quite important, but also involve many other considerations. Newly added claims 16-21 are directed to even more clearly claiming the single-sheet registration form and key packet in this regard.

Applicant's representative believes that the following two paragraphs may more clearly state that which Applicant's representative intended to state in the above-quoted two paragraphs in the originally filed response:

The Examiner's proposed embodiment, in its unfolded form, is not rectangular. Indeed, once folded, the folded form would be rectangular, but, in general, folded forms cannot be reliably printed in computer printers, and folded forms with in which edges are not sealed frequently lead to paper-feeding jams and other problems. Even the thickness of single-sheet forms must be carefully controlled to allow for printing in a computer printer, as shown in materials provided as exhibits, and discussed in the following paragraph, but the thickness of folded forms introduces unacceptable variations, potential slippage, and many other problems. Whether or not the Examiner's proposed embodiment is rectangular after folding is therefore immaterial. The Examiner's proposed embodiment is not rectangular when unfolded, and therefore is not suitable for printing in a computer printer in unfolded form. Moreover, and perhaps most importantly, Applicant claims, in claim 1, "a rectangular, single-sheet registration form and key packet" that includes "an unfolded key packet." Claims 11 and 16 include similar language. Thus, whether or not the Examiner's proposed embodiment is rectangular after folding is immaterial, because Applicant clearly claims a single-sheet registration form and key packet that is rectangular prior to folding, in claim 1, and in subsequent independent claims, a single-sheet registration form and key packet that includes an unfolded key packet and that can be printed on a computer printer. Thus, not only would the Examiner's proposed embodiment not reliable work in the intended application, the Examiner's proposed embodiment is clearly not encompassed by Applicant's claims.

Applicant provides, as an enclosure, a declaration and exhibits that detail interactions with a major client regarding certain of the many parameters that need to be considered for producing a single-sheet registration form and key packet that can be printed in a commercially available computer printer. As will hopefully be appreciated by the Examiner, producing such a form is not simply selecting dimensions and shape, although those considerations are quite important, but also involves many other considerations. Newly added claims 16-21 are directed to even more clearly claiming the single-sheet registration form and key packet in this regard. Applicant's representative believes that these newly added claims are supported by the specification, because the

specification clearly indicates that the single-sheet registration form and key packet is intended to be printed on a computer laser printer, and any form designed for printing on a computer laser printer in a commercial environment would need to conform to the computer-printer-manufacturer's specifications.

All of the claims remaining in the application are now clearly allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted, Ted Eugene Wright Olympic Patent Works PLLC

Robert W. Bergstrom Registration No. 39,906

Enclosures:
Postcard
Form PTO-1083 in duplicate

Olympic Patent Works PLLC P.O. Box 4277 Seattle, WA 98104 206.621.1933 telephone 206.621.5302 fax